

## REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the Office Action dated  
5 November 07, 2005.

### Claim Amendments

Claims 10-13 are amended as shown above to more distinctly clarify the claimed elements.  
10

### Rejections to the Claims

#### **35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,092,102 issued to Wagner (herein referred to as  
15 "Wagner").

Applicant describes and claims features of a centralized alert delivery system that receives alerts for its subscribers from various alert sources. The centralized alert delivery system categorizes the alerts according to the source of the alert or the content of the alert. Subscribers pre-specify one or more  
20 delivery modes for each of the alert categories they are interested in. When the centralized alert delivery system receives an alert for a subscriber, the system forwards the alert to the subscriber according to the one or more pre-specified delivery modes. If an attempt to deliver an alert using a first delivery mode fails,

the centralized alert delivery system may attempt to deliver the alert using a second delivery mode. (*Application*, Abstract.)

Claim 1 recites a method, comprising:

- 5       receiving an alert for a user from one of multiple alert sources;  
      mapping the alert to a delivery mode; and  
      transmitting the alert to the user according to the delivery mode.

Wagner does not show or disclose “receiving an alert”, or receiving the  
10   alert from one of multiple alert sources, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Wagner  
     only describes a notification system that receives information – not an alert.  
     Further, Wagner describes analyzing the information and then generating an  
     alert within the Wagner system. (*Wagner*, Abstract; col. 6, lines 24-44.) The  
     Office agrees that Wagner describes a system that generates an alert, as  
15   evidenced by the statement, “Col. 6, lines 30-36 describes the general concept  
     of generating an alert.” (*Office Action*, page 2.) Because Wagner describes a  
     system that **generates** an alert after receiving the information, it is clear that the  
     information received by the Wagner system is not, in and of itself, an alert.  
     Further, Wagner does not describe a system that receives an alert from one of  
20   multiple alert sources. Rather, the Wagner system is a single alert source that  
     **generates** alerts based on received information.

Wagner describes **receiving information, generating** an alert, and  
sending the alert to a user. Wagner does not describe receiving an alert. The

application, on the other hand, describes receiving an alert, and delivering the alert to a user. Applicant clearly describes a system that is not in and of itself an alert generation system, but a system that interfaces with current alert generation systems. No where does the Application indicate that the system  
5 **generates** an alert based on received information – only that the system delivers alerts generated by other alert generation systems.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Wagner for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

10

Claims 2-15 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 (either directly or indirectly). Additionally, some or all of claims 2-15 are allowable over Wagner for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 10 recites:

15           transmitting the alert to the user according to the first delivery action; and

              transmitting the alert to the user according to the second delivery action if transmitting the alert to the user according to the first delivery action is unsuccessful.

20

Wagner does not show or disclose conditionally transmitting an alert to a user according to a secondary delivery mode, as recited in claim 10.

The Office contends that the elements recited in Claim 10 are described in Wagner, Table V and column 14, lines 39-46. (*Office Action*, page 8.)

5 Applicant respectfully disagrees because Table V only illustrates characteristics of various communication channels. For example, messages sent via a 2-way pager are encrypted, while messages sent via email are not encrypted. Furthermore, messages sent via a 2-way pager are not fail-safe, but messages sent via a 2-way pager with fail-safe are fail-safe. Neither Table V, nor the cited  
10 sections of Wagner, describe "transmitting the alert to the user according to the second delivery action if transmitting the alert to the user according to the first delivery action is unsuccessful," as recited in Claim 10.

The Office cites Wagner, column 14, lines 39-46, which states:

15 As shown in FIG. 3, for fail-safe communication channels, the communication channel manager 124 accepts an acknowledgement 125 of receipt of the message 38 from the user of the fail-safe communication channel. If the acknowledgement 125 is not provided by the user within a predefined time, then the  
20 message 38 is resent to the user and the process of checking for the acknowledgement 125 is repeated.

This section of Wagner only describes re-transmitting an alert using the same delivery method, and not transmitting the alert according to a second delivery action if transmitting according to a first delivery action is unsuccessful, as recited in claim 10. Accordingly, by virtue of its dependence on claim 1, and  
5 for at least the reasons stated above, claim 10 is allowable over Wagner and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 16 recites a centralized alert delivery system, comprising:

an input/output (I/O) module configured to receive alerts  
10 from multiple alert sources;  
a mapping module configured to map an alert to a delivery mode; and  
a communications layer that interfaces to one or more communications modules, the communications layer being  
15 configured to receive the mapped alert and deliver the alert via a communications module according to the delivery mode associated with the alert.

Wagner does not show or disclose “an input/output module configured to  
20 receive alerts from multiple alert sources,” as recited in claim 16. The Office refers to Wagner Fig. 1 as “illustrating an input/output module for inputting alert information (20) and outputting alerts to users (10, 12, 14)”. (*Office Action*, page 8.) Applicant respectfully points out that the “information” illustrated in

Wagner Fig. 1 does not represent an alert, but rather, represents information that can be analyzed and from which an alert may be generated.

Specifically, Wagner states “the notification system 8 includes an information receiving function 22...for receiving the information 16...the clinical  
5 event monitor 4 which analyzes the stored information to determine an event (E) 18 and generate an alert 26...” (Wagner, column 6, lines 24-31.) Clearly, the information receiving function of the system described in Wagner only receives information, but does not receive alerts as does the input/output module recited in claim 16.

10 Accordingly, claim 16, along with dependent claims 17-27, are allowable over Wagner for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 28 recites a computer system comprising “a subscription layer  
15 configured to receive an alert from an alert source and assign a delivery mode to the alert”. As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Wagner does not show or disclose that an alert is received from an alert source, as recited in claim 28. Rather, Wagner only describes a notification system that can receive information, analyze the information, and then generate an alert.

20 Accordingly, claim 28 along with dependent claims 29-34 are allowable over Wagner and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 35 recites "receiving an alert from one of a plurality of alert sources". As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Wagner does not show or disclose "receiving an alert", as recited in claim 35. Accordingly, claim 35 along with dependent claims 36-42 are allowable over  
5 Wagner and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

Claims 1-42 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present  
10 application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned agent to discuss the unresolved issue.

15

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201

20 Dated: 1/6/06



Name: Kayla D. Brant  
Reg. No. 46,576  
Phone No. (509) 324-9256 ext. 242